UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Case No. 1:06-cr-44

Grand Rapids, Michigan VS.

April 2, 2009

MICHAEL WAYNE HESHELMAN, 2:29 p.m.

Defendant. HON. JANET T. NEFF

ARRAIGNMENT, INITIAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE, DETENTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE HUGH W. BRENNEMAN, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Mr. Daniel Y. Mekaru

> United States Attorney's Office The Law Building - Fifth Floor

330 Ionia Ave., NW

Grand Rapids, MI 49503

(616) 456-2404

For the Defendant: Mr. Christopher E. Tracy

Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP

444 W. Michigan Ave. Kalamazoo, MI 49007 (269) 337-7708

I N D E X

2

<u>WITNESSES - GOVERNMENT</u> :	<u>PAGE</u>
TIMOTHY WETHERBEE	
Direct examination by Mr. Mekaru Cross-examination by Mr. Tracy	20 34

WITNESSES - DEFENSE:

None

<u>EXHIBITS</u>	MARKED	<u>RECEIVED</u>
GX#1 - FBI Form 302	22	22
GX#2 - Affidavit in support of extradition	24	25
GX#3 - Extradition fax	25	25
GX#4 - Heshelman letter to embassy	29	30
GX#5 - Heshelman letter to embassy	31	31

```
Grand Rapids, Michigan
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Thursday, April 2, 2009 - 2:29 p.m.

THE COURT: The next matter, Mr. Mekaru?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor. It's the matter of United States versus Michael Wayne Heshelman, case number 1:06-cr-44. This is the date and time set for Mr. Heshelman's arraignment, his detention hearing, and initial pretrial conference.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you.

You are Michael Wayne Heshelman?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Fine.

Counsel, would you bring your client up to the lectern for purposes of the arraignment?

MR. TRACY: Yes. Your Honor, Chris Tracy on behalf of Michael Heshelman and, obviously, the defendant is present as well.

THE COURT: All right.

Before we go any farther, Mr. Heshelman, I don't want to mispronounce your last name. How do you pronounce it?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, your Honor.

Heshelman, yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Heshelman, this is the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan. You are here because you have been charged in a multi-

2.3

count Indictment with various allegations of wire fraud and money laundering and so forth.

First of all, have you received a copy of this Indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had a chance to read it over?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: There are in this Indictment 52 separate counts, each count is a separate criminal charge, and you are not charged in all of these counts but you are charged in a large number of these counts. Do you understand that each of these counts is a separate criminal charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are charged in Count 1 with conspiring to commit wire fraud. Counts 2 through 27 with actually committing wire fraud. In Count 28 with conspiring to commit money laundering. In Counts 29 through 34 with actual instances of money laundering.

In Counts 35 through 38 you are charged with committing international money laundering. And in Counts 39 through 46 you are charged with engaging in monetary transactions and property derived from money laundering.

Do you understand all of those charges?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not sure I understand the last one, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mekaru, do you want to explain what the government means when it alleges that the defendant engaged in transactions -- property transactions derived from unlawful activity, specifically, money laundering?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor. Essentially what those charges involve would be the spending of illegal proceeds and spending more than \$10,000 of monies that were derived from, in this case, a fraudulent scheme.

So under 1957 you're prohibited from spending those proceeds. Under 1956 it would involve transactions that were engaged either to conceal the nature of those proceeds or to facilitate, to further facilitate the scam.

THE COURT: And where does property come into this?

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, property can either be,
well, it's real or personal property, and within the definition
of the statute property would include funds, cash.

THE COURT: Would you read Counts 39 through 46 or at least the text of those counts? They've been grouped together and there's -- I know part of that information is contained in a chart, but if you would read the part above that.

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Heshelman, you can follow along if you wish --

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- in Counts 39 through 46.

MR. MEKARU: All right. Counts 39 through 46.

"Money Laundering. Introduction. The grand jury incorporates by reference Counts 1 through 27 of this Indictment. On the following dates listed Michael Wayne Heshelman received a victim's funds which he used to purchase goods and services and to pay personal expenses.

"Charge. On or about the following dates in the Southern Division of the Western District of Michigan and elsewhere, the Defendant, Michael Wayne Heshelman, did knowingly engage in monetary transactions by, through, and to a financial institution affecting interstate commerce in criminally derived property of a value greater than \$10,000, such monetary transactions as described below having been derived from a specified unlawful activity; that is, wire fraud."

Your Honor, the counts go on to in table form list the number of the count, the date of the wire transaction or transfer, the amount of that wire transfer, who the funds were sent from and who they were sent to.

And it's the government's theory of this case that Mr. Heshelman directed the attorney, Kenneth Warner Mayer, to pay funds to the listed entities essentially paying his hotel bill and transferring money for his use and benefit in many cases in foreign countries.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

```
Mr. Heshelman, does that help you understand the
1
 2
    nature of the charges?
 3
                THE DEFENDANT: The word "property" as you described
 4
    it on there was went through me, what property they were trying
 5
    to explain I had bought with any of these proceeds.
 6
                THE COURT: Okay. I think that answers that question
7
           Do you understand these charges?
 8
                MR. TRACY: Beyond that, your Honor?
 9
                THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but I didn't buy any property.
10
                THE COURT:
                           I'm not asking if you did it or not.
                MR. TRACY: No, he's asking do you understand the
11
12
    charges?
13
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand the charges.
14
                THE COURT: All right.
15
                Counsel, do you want these charges read again or any
    other charges read?
16
17
                MR. TRACY: No, your Honor, we waive formal reading
18
    beyond what Mr. --
19
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
                Now, Mr. Heshelman, I think we went over the maximum
20
21
    penalties before but I'm going to do it again.
```

The maximum penalty for Count 1, the charge of conspiring to commit wire fraud, that carries a maximum penalty of not more than five years in prison and a fine of not more than \$250,000. There would also be a period of supervised release

22

2.3

24

2.3

after any prison term of not more than three years. There would be a mandatory special assessment of \$100, and restitution could be ordered as well.

Counts 2 through 27, as I said before, are all separate counts of wire fraud. Each carries its own penalty. In each case the maximum penalty is again not more than five years in prison and a fine of not more than \$250,000. There'd be a period of supervised release after any prison term of not more than three years, a \$100 special assessment and again restitution.

The penalty for conspiring to commit money laundering as well as Counts 29 through 34, which allege the actual money laundering incidents themselves, each of those charges carries a maximum penalty of not more than 20 years in prison and fine of not more than \$500,000 or twice the value of the property involved in the transaction whichever is greater.

There would also be a period of supervised release after any prison term of not more than three years. Again, there could be restitution ordered, and there would be a mandatory \$100 special assessment as to each count.

Counts 35 through 38 alleging international money laundering each carry a maximum penalty of not more than 20 years in prison and a fine of \$500,000 or twice the value of the monetary instrument or funds involved in the transportation, transmission or transfer, whichever is greater. Again, there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

would be a period of supervised release after any prison term of up to three years, restitution, and a special assessment of \$100.

So that's for Counts 35, 36, 37 and 38.

Counts 39 through 46 each carry a maximum penalty of not more than ten years in prison and a fine of not more than \$250,000, a period of supervised release after any prison term of not more than three years, restitution, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand the maximum penalties for each of those counts pertaining to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Count 53 is not a separate criminal offense. It's labeled "Forfeiture allegations."

And in this provision the government is putting you on notice and the other defendants on notice that it seeks to have you forfeiture certain money or other property that was obtained as a result of the other alleged violations or was used to facilitate those violations.

So in effect they are asking you give up any right, title, or interest you'd have to that property as a result of this purported criminal behavior. That would all be in addition to any fines that would otherwise be imposed.

Again that's a notice provision; it's not a separate criminal offense. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I think so, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

```
THE COURT: All right. Now, you have the right to
have an attorney represent you at all times in this matter. You
have the right to court-appointed counsel if you cannot afford to
hire your own attorney.
            Mr. Tracy, I don't recall if we appointed you are you
are retained?
                       I'm appointed, your Honor.
            MR. TRACY:
            THE COURT: You're appointed. All right. Fine.
            So Mr. Tracy will represent you as these proceedings
continue.
          If you find you have the resources to hire an attorney
yourself you are, of course, free to do that and that person
would substitute in for Mr. Tracy, I presume.
            You also have the right to remain silent, and that
means you don't have to talk about this case with anybody.
Whatever you do say can be used against you in court. You are
free, of course, to talk in confidence to your attorney.
            Do you understand those rights?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The law presumes that you are innocent of these charges and that means the burden is on the government to prove that you're guilty. And the government has to prove your guilt of these charges beyond any reasonable doubt before you can be convicted of them.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: This means -- you don't have to thank me.

Those are rights that you have.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: You have the right to have a trial on these charges and that would be a public and a speedy trial and a trial by a jury with the assistance of your attorney. And at that trial you have the right to confront and cross-examine any witnesses called by the government to prove its case against you.

You have the right to call witnesses to testify on your behalf. If you want somebody to come in who doesn't want to come in voluntarily for some reason you can obtain a court order, we call that a subpoena, to have that person brought in.

Your attorney can present other evidence on your behalf and you have the right to testify at trial if you want to. You have the right not to testify at trial if you don't want to, again, because you have the right to remain silent.

And you also have the right to plead either not guilty or guilty to each of these charges. Do you believe you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I have received a Defendant's Rights Form and it looks like you've signed this form earlier this afternoon. Is that your signature?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you have a chance to read this form over before you signed it?

```
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
1
 2
                THE COURT: Any questions about it?
 3
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                No, your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: All right. Any questions about anything
 5
    I've talked to you about so far this afternoon?
 6
                THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
 7
                THE COURT: All right.
 8
                Counsel, how does your client plead to these charges?
 9
                MR. TRACY: He pleads not guilty, your Honor.
10
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you. A plea of not guilty will be
    entered as to all counts. That concludes the arraignment.
11
12
    Please have a seat.
                            Thank you.
13
                MR. TRACY:
14
                THE COURT:
                           At this point we will move into the
15
    initial pretrial conference. I have received an initial pretrial
16
    conference summary statement from both parties.
17
                Are there going to be modifications to either one of
18
    these?
            Government?
19
                MR. MEKARU: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT:
20
                           Mr. Tracy?
21
                MR. TRACY:
                            No, your Honor.
22
                THE COURT:
                            All right. Let's go through them briefly
23
    or quickly at least.
24
                As far as oral statements are concerned under Rule
25
    16(a)(1)(A), there are certain records of oral statements that
```

are identified here and this indicates these records or statements have been furnished to defense counsel.

Is that correct, Mr. Mekaru?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Mr. Tracy, you have received those?

MR. TRACY: I just got them, your Honor, so I believe I have.

THE COURT: All right. Fine.

As far as written or recorded statements under 16(a)(1)(B), the government states there are 89 consensually monitored telephone calls and e-mail correspondence over a period of approximately five years.

There are some letters that are dated here, and that all of this has been disclosed to defense counsel, and I guess there is an attachment here that lists the dates of recordings and e-mails in question.

Mr. Mekaru, you've turned over that material?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor. If I may.

I explained to counsel, we provided a disk that contains all of the reports in this matter with the attachments. So if there was a recording we have the 302 of that incident.

Rather than actually attaching the recording we attached the transcript of the recording, advised counsel that if he wants to hear the actual recording or get a copy of that to

let us know and then we can make a copy for him.

2.3

There was just so many recordings that are actually on tape. It would take a little longer than just copying them digitally so we'd ask for his cooperation to limit the production at this point to just the transcripts with the option of providing him with whatever tape recording he wants.

We did provide him with one recording we thought was of particular importance. He has the recording, the transcript, along with the FBI report that went along with that incident.

THE COURT: All right. Fine.

Is that agreeable to you, Mr. Tracy?

MR. TRACY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you. Thank you.

And the government has disclosed the defendant's prior criminal history, and as far as physical evidence is concerned it consists of certain records including bank records, wire transfers, checks, miscellaneous business records and hotel information.

In addition, there are documents, correspondence, e-mails, summary documents, spreadsheets, pictures, photographs, and transcripts. These are available for inspection and copying, and counsel should make contact with the FBI special agent identified here.

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, again if I may?

THE COURT: Yes.

Patricia R. Pritchard, Certified Electronic Reporter (616) 364-4943

2.3

```
MR. MEKARU: Regarding the bank records, there's a large banker box of documents that have been -- they're being scanned by my office. It's my understanding per my assistant we're up to about 4,000 pages. Those records are going to be copied, we hope, onto a DVD and we can provide counsel with a copy of those records.

We've also provided him with actually a spreadsheet that will break down a lot of that information into a more easily
```

We were hoping, actually, to get done with the scanning these week. I don't know if that's going to be possible since today's Thursday, but as soon as we get the scanning done we'll turn those over. It'll probably be next week.

THE COURT: All right. So you're going to turn over a scanned copy of all of these documents, and I assume they're available for inspection on an individual basis by Mr. Tracy?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

digestible form. That has been turned over.

That's agreeable with you, Counsel?

MR. TRACY: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Fine. There apparently are going to be no reports as far as the government is concerned regarding scientific tests or examinations.

MR. MEKARU: Again, I'm sorry.

My agent advises -- and it doesn't relate to Mr.

2.3

Heshelman -- but we had a document that was discovered in the former residence of Mr. Sherwood. The document was preserved for fingerprints and examined. The fingerprint analysis came back negative for any of the charged defendants.

My apologies. When we filed this I was unaware that there was a fingerprint report. He's since found it so --

THE COURT: So there was a fingerprint report? You're going to furnish that or --

MR. MEKARU: That was provided to counsel I think as a separate discovery item.

THE COURT: All right. And as a matter of fact you did check that off in one box but not the left hand index box, so we'll just note that the government does expect to have a report or has at least one report available pertaining to fingerprints.

The parties have agreed upon reciprocal discovery. Defense counsel or defendant has requested disclosure of 404(b) evidence. The government will provide pretrial notice of 404(b) evidence by two weeks prior to the final pretrial conference.

Now, are you telling us that you intend to definitely do it and you will do it by that date, or are you telling us that you don't know if you're going to do it but if you do it you'll do it by that date?

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, at this juncture we do intend to introduce 404(b) evidence if all the defendants go to trial. I think some of it may relate, for example, more to Mr.

Sherwood. There is evidence of other fraudulent activity by Mr. Heshelman.

We've provided counsel with reports for all of the other activity. It's included in that CD so we did provide detail of all of that.

At this juncture we do intend to introduce at trial 404(b) evidence. The reason why we'd ask for it two weeks prior is to the extent that we find anything else among the records of the FBI we'll want to have the opportunity to continue to have the option of pursuing other 404(b) evidence.

THE COURT: Well, it sounds like you do presently intend to introduce some as things stand today.

MR. MEKARU: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. So I'll note that.

This will be a jury trial. The government estimates it will take two weeks to try the case.

Mr. Tracy, from your brief encounter with this case is that a reasonably accurate estimate at this point as far as you know?

MR. TRACY: I have nothing to suggest otherwise at this point.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

Now, I don't know if the government has a policy on plea negotiations in this case or not.

You did not indicate that you did, Mr. Mekaru. Do

2.3

you have such a policy and, if so, would you state it for the defendant's benefit?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor. It is generally the policy of the Department of Justice that if a case is going to be resolved through a negotiated resolution, that those discussions be resolved no later than seven days prior to the date set for trial.

Given the nature of this case and the complexity of the allegation and the amount of documents involved any sort of plea deadline is going to be substantially before the date of the trial.

We will provide counsel, your counsel, with a proposed plea offer along with a deadline if that's going to -- if the case is going to be resolved through a negotiated resolution.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mekaru.

Obviously, the defendant has no obligation to plead guilty whatsoever but if he does want to enter into negotiations with the government we do have that policy and he ought to be aware of it.

Is there anything else we need to talk about as far as the initial pretrial conference is concerned, Mr. Mekaru?

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I realize this isn't necessarily this Court's scheduling matter but I just wanted to make note that the district court did set this matter for trial

in May.

I spoke to counsel about this. Given the fact that he's just now coming into the case we would ask this Court in general to reschedule the trial date to allow counsel enough time to prepare. I don't know even if with a revised date whether that's even enough time given the nature of the allegation but, thank you.

THE COURT: Where do the other two defendants stand?

Are they -- I think there are two other defendants?

MR. MEKARU: Yes, sir. They've already appeared.

THE COURT: All right. May I suggest this since I think just kind of throwing it up in the air and hoping somebody catches the ball might not work.

The two of you might want to talk to Judge Neff's case manager perhaps following today's hearings if that's convenient and see what can be done at least to let her know the problems, and if that doesn't resolve it you might want to file something with Judge Neff's office, but I have no control over here docket and I think I'd be an unnecessary cog in the machinery to have it keep going through my office because from now on you're dealing directly with Judge Neff's office.

MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

We're also slated for a detention hearing. Are the parties prepared to go forward with that at this time?

```
MR. MEKARU: Yes, your Honor.
1
 2
                MR. TRACY:
                            Yes, your Honor.
 3
                            All right.
                THE COURT:
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I would note for the Court
 4
 5
    that the pretrial services officer has not had an opportunity to
 6
    interview the defendant so I think at this point you have a
 7
    little less information than you might typically have but we are
 8
    prepared to go forward.
 9
                THE COURT: Well, the defendant was extradited into
10
    this country from Switzerland; is that correct?
11
                MR. MEKARU: That is correct, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Does anybody have that material?
12
13
                MR. MEKARU: I do, your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: All right.
15
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I think for the matter of an
16
    orderly proceeding and hearing and introduction of exhibits I'd
17
    like to call Special Agent Tim Wetherbee.
18
              TIMOTHY WETHERBEE, GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS, SWORN
19
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. MEKARU:
20
21
    Q
          Special Agent Wetherbee, how are you currently employed?
22
          I'm a Special Agent with the FBI here in Grand Rapids.
    Α
2.3
    Q
          How long have you been in law enforcement?
24
    Α
          About 17 years.
25
          As part of your duties as an FBI agent do you investigate
    Q
```

```
violations of federal criminal laws?
1
 2
          Yes, I do.
    Α
 3
          Would that include allegations of wire fraud, mail fraud,
 4
    or scams that cross state or international boundaries?
 5
    Α
          Yes.
 6
          Including other associated offenses such as money
 7
    laundering?
 8
    Α
          Yes.
 9
          Were you involved in the investigation of Michael Wayne
10
    Heshelman?
11
          Yes, I was.
12
          All right. Are you familiar with the case and the
13
    allegations?
          Yes.
14
    Α
15
          All right. At some point did you actually have some
16
    communication with Mr. Heshelman in or about November of 2006?
17
          Yes, I did.
    Α
18
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, if I could approach the
19
    witness.
20
                THE COURT: Yes.
21
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, if I may I'd like to do
22
    this, give you a full set of documents and as we go through we'll
2.3
    introduce them to avoid zig-zagging back and forth.
24
                THE COURT: All right.
25
                Any objection, Counsel?
```

```
22
```

```
MR. TRACY: No, your Honor, no objection.
1
 2
                 (Government's Exhibit No. 1 marked.)
 3
    BY MR. MEKARU:
          All right, Agent Wetherbee, you have before you what's been
 4
 5
    marked as Government Exhibit No. 1. Is this an FBI Form 302?
 6
          Yes, it is.
    Α
 7
          It's essentially a report of some sort of contact with some
 8
    sort of investigative activity by the agent?
 9
    Α
          Yes, it is.
10
    Q
          Is this your 302?
11
    Α
          Yes.
12
          Does this relate to a conversation you had with Mr.
13
    Heshelman?
14
    Α
          Yes.
15
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, move for the admission of
16
    Exhibit No. 1.
17
                            No objection, your Honor.
                MR. TRACY:
18
                THE COURT:
                            Admitted.
                 (Government's Exhibit No. 1 admitted.)
19
    BY MR. MEKARU:
20
21
          All right. Agent Wetherbee, can you tell us a little bit
22
    about the context of your contact with Mr. Heshelman?
2.3
          Mr. Heshelman called me at my office and I spoke with him
    over the telephone. He called to ask about an investigation that
24
25
    was involving him.
```

Q All right. Does this document essentially report some of the statements that Mr. Heshelman made?

A Yes.

1.5

2.3

Q All right. For purposes of this issue of detention, I put your attention to the last paragraph.

A Yes.

Q Did you have a discussion about where Mr. Heshelman was living so you could have an opportunity to contact him again if you wished or some discussion of that nature?

A I asked him if he would provide his address for me. He provided his telephone number, his cellular telephone number, and told me that he was living in an apartment in Zurich,

Switzerland, but declined to provide that address to me. His statement to me was if I tell you where I'm living you'll come and arrest me.

Q Now, as to the context of that statement, did Mr. Heshelman know at this point that he was under some sort of investigation?

A He was aware that we had conducted grand jury in the matter, and he was aware that it had been going on for some -- a number of months.

And he inquired at that point in time whether he was going to be arrested. I did not specifically tell him whether he was or he wasn't. I told him that time was a grand jury investigation; that if he wanted to find out further information on it that he could talk to our legal attache who was at the

embassy in Berne, Switzerland.

- Q Okay. That last point according to the embassy or to the consulate, that's not referenced in the 302?
- A No, I did not put that in there.
- Q But, nonetheless, do you have a clear recollection that was part of the conversation?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

25

(Government Exhibit No. 2 marked.)

- Q All right. You have before you what's been marked as Government Exhibit No. 2. Can you tell us what Government Exhibit No. 2 is?
- A It is an affidavit in support of extradition. It appears that part of it is the affidavit that was done by the Assistant United States Attorney, yourself, and part of it was the arrest warrant, part of it was the relevant statutes, and part of it was also my affidavit for the support of the extradition.

And then finally the attachments to it are a passport photograph, a fingerprint card for Mr. Heshelman.

- Q The passport photograph, does it say "Application for Passport?"
- 21 A Yes, it does.
- Q Does it appear per this document that the passport
 application may have been made while in Switzerland, in the lower
 left hand corner?
 - A Yes, there is a stamp there for the American consulate

```
officer in Berne, Switzerland, Thomas Rice.
1
 2
          And this extradition affidavit was actually presented
 3
    before this Honorable Court, before Hugh W. Brenneman, Junior?
 4
          Yes, it was.
 5
          All right. Now, was the request for extradition actually
    forwarded onto the Swiss authorities?
 6
 7
          I believe it was, yes.
 8
                 (Government Exhibit No. 3 marked.)
 9
          All right. You have before you what's been marked as
    Q
10
    Government Exhibit No. 3.
11
          Yes.
                MR. MEKARU: I'm sorry, your Honor, as a housekeeping
12
13
    matter, we move for the admission of Exhibit No. 2.
                            No objection.
14
                MR. TRACY:
                THE COURT: Two will be admitted.
15
16
                 (Government's Exhibit No. 2 admitted.)
17
                MR. MEKARU: All right.
18
    BY MR. MEKARU:
          Exhibit No. 3. What is Exhibit No. 3?
19
          This is a fax to the US Department of Justice regarding the
20
    extradition of Mr. Heshelman from Switzerland.
21
                MR. MEKARU: Move for the admission of Exhibit No. 3.
22
23
                MR. TRACY: No objection, your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: No. 3 will be admitted.
                 (Government Exhibit No. 3 admitted.
25
```

BY MR. MEKARU:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Q Now, would it be fair to say that Exhibit No. 3 is essentially confirmation that Mr. Heshelman had been ordered extradited from Switzerland?
- A Yes.
- Q Now, do you know as to whether or not -- back up. Were you briefed by authorities in Switzerland as to the status of the extradition proceeding?
- A I got some notifications from our legate there, whatever he could find out what was going on with it.
- Q Okay. Just so the Court and the defendant understands, is a legate, is this an FBI agent who's posted in a foreign country to act as a liaison between the domestic FBI and foreign agencies?
- 15 A That would be correct.
 - Q Okay. Now, according to the information you received from the legate, did Mr. Heshelman agree to return to the United States voluntarily?
 - A It was his understanding that he was fighting extradition.
 - MR. TRACY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that, your Honor. We don't have any basis for that in terms of what we have in terms of the exhibit, and it's a comment that I don't have any basis to cross-examine on.
 - THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection based on the way the question was asked.

```
MR. MEKARU: Okay. Just so we understand though,
1
 2
    your Honor, hearsay is permissible in this proceeding.
 3
                THE COURT: Well, I'm aware of that.
 4
                MR. MEKARU: Thank you.
 5
                THE COURT: But I think you have to lay some
    foundation for the question.
 6
 7
                MR. MEKARU: Yes, sir. I just wanted to clarify.
 8
    Thank you.
 9
    BY MR. MEKARU:
10
          All right. In December 2008, Agent Wetherbee, were you
    advised that there was some sort of action taken against Mr.
11
    Heshelman in Switzerland?
12
13
          I was advised that he had been arrested on Swiss charges,
14
    yes.
15
          He wasn't arrested based on the activity that's the subject
16
    of this indictment in the Western District of Michigan; is that
17
    true?
18
          That is correct. Not at that time.
19
          Did the information you received detail at all what sort of
    allegation was being made against Mr. Heshelman?
20
21
    Α
          The only thing I was told that it was a 300,000 Euro fraud.
22
                THE COURT: I'm sorry? Say that again.
23
                THE WITNESS: A 300,000 Euro fraud.
24
                THE COURT: Euro. I'm sorry. I thought you said
25
    "year old." All right.
                             300,000 Euro.
```

THE WITNESS: Euro.

> THE COURT: Fine. All right.

BY MR. MEKARU:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

2.3

24

- Now, at the time of that arrest, is it fair to say the Swiss authorities may have had some understanding that there was some interest though by the US authorities in Mr. Heshelman?
- They were aware that we were looking for him. Yes.
- Okay. Now, did his arrest by the Swiss authorities prompt some sort of action by the US regarding extradition?
- We went forward with obtaining a provisional arrest warrant and filed extradition paperwork.
- As noted in Exhibit No. 2?
- Α Yes.
 - All right. And were you being briefed by the legate, by the FBI agent in Switzerland as to some of the information that was ongoing with respect to the extradition?
- 17 Yes. Α
- 18 Who was the legate?
- 19 It was Daniel Boyd.
- And was he being advised of the proceedings either through 20 the embassy or through the Swiss authorities?
 - He was making contact directly with the Swiss authorities.
 - Now, according to the information that was being provided by the Swiss authorities and passed to Special Agent Boyd and onto you, what was happening with Mr. Heshelman's extradition?

```
A That he was opposing the extradition.
```

- Q And did they, in fact, have a hearing?
- A This is my understanding, yes.
- Q And ultimately was Mr. Heshelman ordered extradited from Switzerland?
- A Yes, according to this document he was -- they made a decision February 27th of 2009.
- Q All right. Also according to the document he did not seek to appeal that decision?
- 10 A Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

- Q All right. Now, the result of that extradition action
 ultimately resulted in Mr. Heshelman being transported from
 Switzerland back to United States. We had his initial appearance
 earlier this week?
- $15 \parallel A \qquad \text{Yes.}$
 - Q All right. While Mr. Heshelman was in custody by the Swiss authorities, was he in contact with the US embassy or consulate?
 - A The legate did provide a few letters that he had written to the embassy.
 - (Government Exhibit No. 4 marked.)
- 21 Q You have before you what's been marked as Government 22 Exhibit No. 4.
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q What is Exhibit No. 4?
- 25 A This is one of the letters that was provided to the embassy

```
signed by Mr. Michael Heshelman.
1
 2
                MR. MEKARU: Move for the admission of Exhibit No. 4.
 3
                            No objection, your Honor.
                MR. TRACY:
 4
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you. No. 4 is admitted.
 5
                 (Government Exhibit No. 4 admitted.)
    BY MR. MEKARU:
 6
 7
          All right. Agent Wetherbee, who is the letter addressed
 8
    to?
 9
    Α
          US Consular, Embassador to Switzerland.
10
    0
          If you look at the last page who's it signed by?
          It's signed, "Sincerely, Michael Heshelman."
11
          Did much of this letter talk about the fact that he's been
12
13
    ordered extradited and that he had some information that he
14
    wanted to provide?
15
          Yes, he did want to provide some information regarding the
16
    plight of the US car makers in the UK and Europe as well.
17
          Okay. If you turn to the third page of the letter where it
18
    has the postscript --
19
          Yes.
20
          -- could you read that for me?
21
          "Postscript. My company has or had 500 million Euros in
22
    the deposit of UBS at the time of my arrest.
                                                   The arrest goes
```

back to charges for events that occurred in 1999 through 2001.

To my knowledge there is no complainant plaintiff, only the US

District Court of Western Michigan's word or interpretation of

2.3

24

```
events against mine."
1
 2
          All right. Now, at this point are you in any position to
 3
    either debunk or verify Mr. Heshelman's claim that he has 500
 4
    million Euros?
 5
          I do not.
    Α
                 (Government's Exhibit No. 5 marked.)
 6
7
          All right. And Exhibit No. 5, is this also another letter
    Q
 8
    that was sent to the US Embassy or consulate in Switzerland?
 9
    Α
          It's addressed to "Embassador to Switzerland, US
    Consulate."
10
          If you'd turn to the last page, who's it from?
11
12
          It's signed "M. Heshelman." And the underneath it's
13
    written out in printing, "Michael Heshelman."
14
                MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I'd move for the admission
15
    of Exhibit No. 5.
16
                            No objection, your Honor.
                MR. TRACY:
                THE COURT: No. 5 is admitted.
17
18
                 (Government Exhibit No. 5 admitted.)
    BY MR. MEKARU:
19
          All right. Now without -- this is a multi-page letter, at
20
21
    least 13, 14, 15, maybe 16 pages approximately?
22
    Α
          It's numerous pages, yes.
2.3
    Q
          All right.
24
    Α
          I haven't counted.
25
          It's not my intention to go through the entire letter but
```

```
is it fair to say that Mr. Heshelman is complaining about the prosecution brought against him in the United States?

A Yes.
```

- Q And also in addition he was talking about some of the financial expertise that he could bring to bear on the current global financial situation?
- A I believe that there was information there that he said he could provide.
- Q Beginning on page 11, the bailout of the auto industry going good, hyphen, yes, question mark, no, question mark. Does he go on to say that he has a plan?
- 12 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

1.5

- Q All right. If you go on to page 13 I think this is actually again in the nature of a post-script where he talks about his plan for the auto industry?
- 16 A Yes. On the top it says "Auto industry."
- 17 Q The toxic bank?
- 18 A On the top of the next page.
- 19 Q Instruments?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q Desalination plans, oil contracts?
- 22 A Right, yes.
- 23 Q And then the hydrogen -- source of hydrogen fuel?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Again after his sentence is yet another postscript. Could

```
33
    you read that?
1
 2
          After his signature on the last page?
 3
    0
          Yes.
          It says, "I just heard on CNN about the election in June
 4
 5
    for Iran. I can help facilitate money for the campaign against
 6
    Ahmadinijad, seriously."
 7
          All right. Agent Wetherbee, after the indictment of Mr.
 8
    Heshelman, did the FBI make any efforts to try to flag Mr.
 9
    Heshelman's passport or his travel activity to see if he would
10
    return back to the United States?
          Yes, we did.
11
          Can you describe those efforts?
12
13
          Yes. We talked to Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and
    they put a notice based on his passport for any officer that
14
1.5
    checks his passport to notify both the local ICE agent and myself
16
    of his entry into the United States.
17
          According to the ICE records, was there any indication of
18
    Mr. Heshelman coming back into this country prior to March 27,
    2009?
19
20
    Α
          No.
21
                THE COURT: I'm sorry, what was that last question
```

BY MR. MEKARU: 2.3

again?

22

24

25

Any indication of Mr. Heshelman returning to the United States prior to March 27th, 2009?

```
34
1
          Not between the date of the indictment and March 27th,
    Α
 2
    2009.
 3
          The passport, is that in the possession of the FBI?
    Q
 4
    Α
          Yes.
 5
          Have you reviewed its contents?
    Q
 6
    Α
          Yes.
 7
          Any stamps or indications according to the passport of Mr.
 8
    Heshelman returning to the United States prior to his extradition
 9
    and entry in March of 2009?
10
    Α
          No.
          Nothing further.
11
                             Thank you.
                             Cross-examination?
12
                 THE COURT:
13
                 MR. TRACY:
                            Thank you, your Honor.
                             CROSS-EXAMINATION
14
15
    BY MR. THOMAS:
16
          Good afternoon, Special Agent Wetherbee.
    Q
17
          Good afternoon.
    Α
          We've had a chance to just meet one another here briefly.
18
19
    Α
          Yes.
20
          Let me go through a few things with you following up.
21
    try to keep it somewhat consistent. You still have the exhibits
22
    in front of you, correct?
23
    Α
          Yes.
```

today but as you know that was about a half hour ago --

So this contact -- I'm sorry, I know you produced discovery

24

A Yes.

2.3

Q -- so I haven't gotten through it yet. This contact that occurred reflected --

THE COURT: Counsel, if I may stop you right there. You are certainly entitled to have more time to prepare, and the Court is willing to give you that if you thought that was necessary.

MR. TRACY: Right. Understand, your Honor.

I would like to proceed and depending on what the -I know the Court doesn't have the benefit of the interview, which
we can talk a little bit after the agent leaves the stand, but I
would like to proceed some today depending on with the Court's
instruction we can determine whether we want to hold it over.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you about that --

MR. TRACY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- and if there's going to be a likelihood of a possibility that we would hold this over because your client wants to be interviewed, and for whatever other reason, I will tell you that I have one, two, three, four -- six more hearings depending on how one counts them before the end of the afternoon plus the grand jury and it's already 3:15.

So if we're not going to wind this up today I would rather cut it off sooner rather than later so that I can at least afford the other people an opportunity to be heard today.

MR. TRACY: Understand, your Honor. One, I don't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

```
think this is going to take very long in terms of my examination.
            THE COURT:
                       Good.
            MR. TRACY: Two, I'm not sure that the interview
based on what I have had a chance to talk with my client about
and his family members, who I'll introduce to you in a minute, I
don't think the interview necessarily is going to give a lot more
information to the Court than what we can impart today.
            What I guess I'm getting at is at the end of the day
if you think -- again, at the end of the day is more like a half
hour from now, if you think there's more information that is
needed I don't have a problem with moving things over to next
week, but I think --
            THE COURT: I'm not going to give you a progress
report on this.
                       I understand, your Honor.
            MR. TRACY:
            THE COURT:
                       If you want more time you're more than
welcome to have it.
            MR. TRACY: I don't think I need more time is what
```

MR. TRACY: I don't think I need more time is what I'm saying to you, and I don't know that we're going to do this more efficiently at a later point in time because the agent's here on the stand and it's kind of fresh in all of our minds right now.

THE COURT: Why don't you complete your crossexamination of this agent?

MR. TRACY: Okay.

BY MR. TRACY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

- Q So, in November of '06 this is at least when the transcript was done from Exhibit 1, correct?
- A Yes.
- Q Besides this interview did you conduct any other interviews with my client?
- A No.
- Q Did you have any other contacts with him?
- A He left a few voice mails on my answering machine which I did not return.
- Q Okay. And those were later dates than November of '06, if you recall?
 - A I believe that there were a few before that and then he finally got a hold of me at my desk and then there were some after that, I believe.
- 16 Q Do you remember any contacts from him in '07?
- 17 A Not specifically, no.
- 18 Q Okay. But in any event, in this instance he contacted you?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 \ Q And he told you where he was over in Switzerland?
- 21 A He told me he was in Zurich, yes.
- 22 Q Correct. He gave you his cell phone number?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q And besides telling you that he was in Switzerland he also told you he was in Zurich?

```
A Yes.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q Okay. And as far as you were aware was that true?
- A As far as I was aware, yes.
- Q Okay. Did you have some other intelligence prior to him telling you that that led you to believe that?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. And how long had he been in Switzerland as far as your intelligence had told you?
- 9 A Since about 2004.
- 10 Q Okay.
- 11 A And off and on before that.
- Q All right. So that would you go back in points in time prior to the indictment?
- 14 A Yes.
- Q And as far as you're aware was he trying to hide that from you at all, the fact that he was living in Switzerland?
- 17 A No.

18

- Q Or from any of your other counterparts that were involved with the case?
- 20 A No.
- 21 Q And did you ever try to find his actual location in
- 22 Switzerland?
- A Not personally but I did ask the Swiss to try to locate him.
- 25 Q Do you know whether they were successful or not?

- A They were not until a later date at which time they started their investigation.
- Q Between today and some point in time did you also discover besides having an apartment in Zurich he also had an office?
- A I was told of that by the Swiss, yes.
- Q Okay. So here's a gentlemen apparently now based on what you know now had an apartment and an office that he was functioning out of in Zurich?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

16

17

18

- 10 Q And had been doing that for some period of time?
- 11 A Yes, as far as I'm aware.
 - Q Now, the warrant, which I believe is part of Exhibit 2, not that we need to necessarily look at it, that was issued, the warrant for his arrest was issued back in February of '06?
- 15 A That's correct.
 - Q Did you ever specifically notify Mr. Heshelman of the warrant being issued?
 - A No, I did not.
- 19 Q And as far as you're aware did he have any knowledge of the 20 warrant being issued?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. So that would be, yes, he did not have any knowledge? Just to be careful. It's one of those double negatives.
- 25 A Okay, yes. He was not specifically aware of any arrest

```
Case 1:06-cr-00044-JTN Document 55 Filed 04/22/2009 Page 40 of 54
                                                                      40
    warrant.
1
 2
          Okay. And do you have any information that would lead you
 3
    to believe that he was aware of the indictment?
 4
          He was not. No, I do not.
 5
          Okay. Now, both of his co-defendants, were they living in
 6
    the United States as far as you're aware?
 7
          Yes, they were.
 8
          You were able to -- you or others working on your behalf or
 9
    working with you, you were able to arrest them at some point in
10
    time?
          Yes, we arrested them in December.
11
12
          Okay. And December of what year?
13
    Α
          2008.
14
          And as far as you're aware were they in contact with Mr.
    Heshelman at all in the '08, '07, '06 time period?
15
16
    Α
          I don't have a record of that.
17
                Did you ever try to work through them or other
18
    people that were involved in this case to make contact to Mr.
19
    Heshelman?
          There was a witness that was talking with him via e-mail
20
21
    but not specifically asking him for his address, no.
```

Okay. And then those co-defendants, Mr. Mickelson and Mr. Sherwood, as far as you're aware they're both currently on bond from this court?

Α Correct.

22

2.3

24

```
41
```

```
Now, the Swiss charges for a minute. You had some passing
Q
understanding that the charges involved, quote, unquote,
"$300,000 of a Euro fraud?"
      Correct.
Α
      That's all you know?
Q
      That's all I know.
Α
      Do you know what happened to those charges?
      They were dismissed upon our obtaining a provisional arrest
warrant.
      Okay.
             So, I mean, you've been involved with the system for
a while. I mean, you don't know whether they had good evidence,
bad evidence, what evidence to support those charges, do you?
Α
      I do not.
      Okay. Did the Swiss authorities, as far as you're aware,
were they aware of the charges against Mr. Heshelman brought here
by this Court or through the indictment that's --
Α
      Yes.
      -- before us?
      Yes, they were.
      And had they been aware of that for some period of months
or years prior to --
```

22 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

24

25

Q -- the ultimate arrest?

A Yes. I had been dealing with our legal attache trying to have them locate Mr. Heshelman for us.

```
Q Okay. The delay, which happens sometimes, is the delay, was that more on their end or what was the -- why did it take so long as you're concerned?
```

- A It took quite a while for them to put forth any major effort into locating him.
- Q Okay. Now, I'm assuming you don't know but just in case you have any information. The basis of Mr. Heshelman opposing the extradition, do you know whether it had anything to do with him having concerns about the charges the Swiss brought against him?
- A I do not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

1.5

16

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- 12 Q Do you know one way or the other?
- 13 A I do not.
 - Q Okay. And the only thing that we really have on what the Swiss decided is this Exhibit 3 which is, I believe, a March 17th '09 letter, correct?
- 17 A Correct.
 - Q And in there even though I think you made reference to maybe a, quote, unquote, "hearing happening," there's no reference to a hearing in that letter; am I correct?
 - A Correct.
 - Q So you wouldn't really know that for sure one way or the other?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q You didn't attend any proceedings over in Switzerland?

```
43
```

```
A I did not.
```

- Q Another part you referenced is the passport of Exhibit 2, it includes at least a portion of Mr. Heshelman's passport. I think it's the last three pages or so of Exhibit 2?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

- Q And in that passport there's emergency contact information, correct?
- 8 A Correct.
- 9 Q And that's, I'm aware now having talked with her, that's
 10 his sister Brenda Moore. Are you aware that he has a sister
 11 living in Battle Creek?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And there's a Battle Creek address actually indicated there, right?
- $15 \parallel A \qquad \text{Yes.}$
- 16 Q And it says "relationship, sister?"
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And gives a phone number?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q Did you or anybody else at the FBI contact Mrs. Moore about trying to track down her brother?
- 22 A I did talk to Ms. Moore, yes, prior to the indictment.
- 23 Q Prior to the indictment?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q How about afterwards in terms of trying to get contact

```
information?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

2.3

- A No, she told me at the time that I talked to her prior to the indictment that she did not know where he was living, just that he was living in Switzerland.
- Q But that would have been maybe late '05 or '06?
- A Correct.
 - Q And we don't actually -- I mean three years pass after that, correct --
- A Right.
- Q -- any terms of actually, okay. And there's no additional contact after that time you spoke with her prior to the indictment?
- 13 A That's correct.
 - Q And the Exhibit 4, which is one of these letters to the US Consular or Embassy, I want to be a little precise here because I think you said the letter has reference in the "PS" component of the letter on page three that he has -- "he" meaning Mr.
- Heshelman -- has 500 million Euros, but the letter doesn't say that, right?
 - A I read it my company has or had 500 million Euros on deposit in the deposit of UBS at the time of my arrest.
 - Q Okay. So he does not say that he, Mr. Heshelman, had 500 million Euros, correct?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q It says something about a company having or having had 500

million Euros, correct?

Correct. Α

- And it doesn't say that it's in a bank account of his but rather it says it's in deposit with UBS?
- Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Okay. Now, this flagging process that was discussed a little bit in your direct testimony of his passport, did that also include some flagging over in Europe?
- It did not. It was through our customs.
- Why wasn't something done over in Europe when you knew he was living in Switzerland?
- We did not do an Interpol Red notice because we were hoping that he would venture back into the United States at which time he could be arrested.
- But after a year or so passes, I mean, clearly you had the option of doing a Red notice?

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I'm going to object. extent that there's a delay he can explore that, but the question as to the strategy behind waiting for Mr. Heshelman to return I don't think has much bearing on -- that has to go to the government's thoughts on whether he might return or not, not as to the defendant's willingness to come back to the United States and appear on charges. I just don't see that as having much bearing on the question of detention.

> THE COURT: Mr. Tracy?

```
MR. TRACY: That's fine, your Honor. I can move in a
1
 2
    little slightly different direction.
 3
                THE COURT: All right.
    BY MR. TRACY:
 4
 5
          Now, you mentioned in direct about the passport not showing
 6
    any travel back to the US, correct?
 7
          The only stamp from the US was on March 27th, 2009.
 8
          Okay. So in other words from some period in '03 or '04,
 9
    whatever the period was that he moved over in Switzerland, you
10
    didn't see any other entry mark showing having come back to the
    US prior to this past month?
11
          That's correct.
12
    Α
13
          But did you see travel reflected throughout Europe?
14
          Yes.
    Α
15
          And including to, say, countries like Spain and other
16
    locations?
17
    Α
          Yes.
18
          Did you pay attention to see where he actually went to?
19
    Α
          Yes, there was.
          Was there fairly significant travel throughout Europe?
20
    Q
21
          There was some, yes, not -- I wouldn't say significant but
22
    some, yes.
2.3
          But some travel that occurred both in '07 and '08 and maybe
24
    didn't matter whether it occurred in '09 yet or not but --
25
    Α
          Yes.
```

```
1
          Okay. So that was reflected in the passport?
    Q
 2
    Α
          Yes.
 3
          So presumably again without getting into the strategy part
 4
    of it, if the procedures were working correctly and a Red notice
 5
    was in place, if he would have made the trip from say Switzerland
 6
    to Spain that probably would have triggered something?
 7
          It may have, yes.
 8
    Q
          Okay.
 9
                MR. TRACY: Excuse me one second, your Honor.
10
                THE COURT:
                            Mm-hmm.
                MR. TRACY: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.
11
12
                THE COURT: Fine. Thank you.
13
                Counsel, redirect?
14
                MR. MEKARU: No, your Honor. Thank you.
15
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
16
                You may step down. Please remain available.
17
                Mr. Mekaru?
18
                MR. MEKARU: No further witnesses, your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: Defense?
20
                MR. TRACY: Your Honor, I think it may be -- again, I
21
    know you have a schedule -- it may make some sense if I could
22
    sort of indicate to you from our position what I think can occur
2.3
    in terms of the family members he has. If you directly need to
24
    hear from any of the family members after --
25
                            I'll tell you right up front that's your
                THE COURT:
```

decision, not mine.

MR. TRACY: Okay. What I want to tell you is who's here and where they live and that kind of thing.

What I guess I'm saying is depending on where that goes if you need to hear from them to verify any of that I'd be happy to put them on the stand, but I do not wish to waste the Court's time unless counsel wishes to inquire or the Court wishes to inquire, and I guess I'm trying to save time a little bit.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate your effort. If you're simply going to tell me that so-and-so is here and they live in Battle Creek, I don't need to hear testimony to that. I'll take your representation.

MR. TRACY: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to suggest.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. TRACY: And if something else more detailed needs to occur, that's fine. But I have no witnesses to call at this time but I would like to provide that information to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Any proffer then?

MR. TRACY: Okay. So, your Honor, in terms of people that I've been in contact with that are family members of my client. Brenda Moore, who we heard about a minute ago, emergency contact on the passport, his sister, is here in court today along with one of this nieces, Angie. His aunt.

His parents are both deceased but his Aunt Marjorie, who lives in Battle Creek as well, and his brother-in-law Don,

are all here on his behalf. They all live in Battle Creek. His family was originally from Battle Creek.

They are all, depending on what the Court would consider doing here in terms of the bond issue, they're all willing, whether it be at any of their homes but maybe it makes most sense for Brenda being his sister to have him have residence here in the district, to assist in whatever way the Court determines is appropriate to make sure he has arrived to court hearings and anything else he needs to show up to.

As the Court may be aware -- I know obviously my office location is in Kalamazoo so they're just down the road from where I'm at in terms of being able to get back and forth in terms of those issues.

I know that --

2.3

THE COURT: Are you telling the Court that they would be willing to put him up in their homes?

MR. TRACY: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. TRACY: And they would also be willing if that — other monitoring devices, whether it be a tether or other things, whatever current things that are the state of the art at this point in time, your Honor, if something needs — a machine needs to be placed in their home to that effect or any other thing, they're on board with all of that occurring.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you.

MR. TRACY: In terms of that component that's all I have to proffer. I guess any other statements in terms of supporting what I think would be a basis for bond I can do in summary after, you know, if the government has other comments.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there's no other proffers I guess I have the testimony that I've heard, I've had your proffer, and I've got this rather abbreviated report from the pretrial services office.

Anything further, Mr. Mekaru?

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, I'm a little reluctant to do this but the defendant has offered up his family essentially to in some ways to vouch for him and to provide residence and some claim of stability, and I question their suitability, so I'm inclined to call Brenda Moore.

THE COURT: All right. I have several other matters and this is -- I don't know how much longer this is going to take. I think I'm going to recess this and take the other matters. If we can still get back to this this evening we will, otherwise, I'll have to put it over, but I have too many of those people backing up.

MR. MEKARU: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Tracy?

MR. TRACY: I'm not trying to try your case.

THE COURT: You're not. You're not at all.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TRACY: My client -- to the extent the Court would, you know, consider bond, obviously my client would like to get out sooner than later and begin to make preparations for it. If it works better for scheduling -- and I haven't spoken to Dan in terms of what his schedule is -- if the Court has open time Monday morning, because I think it'd be pretty difficult if we're going to try to wait for the report for the report to be done effectively between now and tomorrow, but I wouldn't like to go much beyond Monday if we could avoid it. I have a hearing down in Kalamazoo but not until 2:00 so for me I need to basically leave by 1:00, so I have pretty much the whole morning available on Monday if that works for the Court and for counsel, and I talked to my client and he understands. THE COURT: Just a moment. While she's checking is Monday morning agreeable with you, Counsel? MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, if I may, I want to check my schedule. THE COURT: All right. We'll try to keep the

THE COURT: All right. We'll try to keep the marshals from arresting you while you use that.

MR. MEKARU: I know. I was asking permission. I checked without -- it did it carefully, your Honor, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Well, some people believe in erring first and then asking for forgiveness.

MR. MEKARU: Your Honor, Anna Pakiela from probation

```
just noted she knows your schedule. You have detention hearings at 9:00, 10:00 and 11:00 and 11:15 on Monday.
```

THE COURT: They also may get pushed back. I don't want to push this one back any further than necessary.

What do we have Monday afternoon?

MR. TRACY: Again, I'm not sure how early we normally start. I can be here at 8:00 or 8:30 if -- just want to let the Court know.

THE COURT: Our office opens at 8:00.

MR. TRACY: Yeah, so --

1.5

THE COURT: The best time would be -- I've got arraignments, detention hearings, 9:00, 10:00 and 11:00, maybe 11:30 on Monday. I've got more hearings starting after lunch and on Tuesday morning as well. Tuesday afternoon -- Tuesday after 10:15 and all day Tuesday afternoon is free. Would that be workable?

MR. TRACY: Your Honor, I'm on the east side of the state that day for other matters. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Well, this case gets priority so we'll put it in at 8:00 on Monday morning.

That agreeable with you, Counsel, Mr. Mekaru?

MR. MEKARU: In terms of assigning for tomorrow,

there's a pretrial services meeting, how much time do they need?

THE COURT: Well, we're not going to do it tomorrow,

I'll tell you right now.

```
53
                MR. MEKARU: Then if the Court wants it Monday
1
2
    morning we'll be there.
 3
                THE COURT: Fine. Good. Everybody's agreed to that.
 4
    Reluctantly, perhaps. We'll recess this matter until 8:00 Monday
 5
    morning.
 6
                MR. MEKARU: And, your Honor, if I may?
 7
                THE COURT: Yes.
 8
                MR. MEKARU: So at this point may the record be clear
 9
    that Brenda Moore has been called as a witness and that she must
10
    appear on Monday.
11
                THE COURT: Yes.
                MR. TRACY: She is available.
12
13
                THE COURT: Fine. She'll be here.
14
                MR. MEKARU: Okay. Thank you.
15
                THE COURT: Thank you.
16
                (At 3:37 p.m., proceedings adjourned)
17
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Patricia R. Pritchard, CER 3752, Certified Electronic Court Reporter for the State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 1 through 54, inclusive, comprise a full, true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the proceedings and testimony recorded in the above-entitled cause.

April 21, 2009

Patricia R. Pritchard /S/ Patricia R. Pritchard, CER 3752